

Mountain Studies Institute
Science and Innovation Center Steering Committee Questionnaire
Summary of Steering Committee Responses
April 2018

Thirteen questionnaire responses were received from Steering Committee members. Thank you! What a great repository of information and views on the Science and Innovation Center concept. We plan to refer back to this information on a regular basis as we continue to scope the Center concept with you.

The information below is MSI's best initial effort to compile, summarize, and group responses in a manner that will help guide the Steering Committee going forward. *Please take the time needed before our April 11 call to review the responses herein as we want everyone on the Steering Committee to understand your colleague's views as we together build our vision for the Center. We believe the responses to the questionnaire demonstrate that there is a consensus building within the Steering Committee for the benefits that a Center can provide as well as the challenges that we will need to overcome to establish it.*

After our April 11 conference call discussion, we will likely use this document to create/refine other materials including speaking points, revision to the vision statement/prospectus, fundraising proposals, etc. Please let us know if you have other suggestions.

A) Highest priority hard rock mining challenges. (Not in order of priority but bunched into four categories so you can see areas with greater emphasis.)

- 1) Health/Environmental**
- 2) Financial/Economics**
- 3) Informational/Educational/Technical**
- 4) Other**

Health/Environmental

Unknown physical safety hazards to humans

Environmental risks from acid rock drainage. Specifically in the BPMD:

- 1) more innovative treatment of adit waters
- 2) responsibly making changes to surface flows to reduce AMD loading
- 3) making correct conclusions about data and implementing good team practices
- 4) assisting in the search for reducing sludge production and sound sludge storage/disposal
- 5) inclusion of land and habitat preservation in AML solutions

Water treatment is effective on a technical basis to meet cleanup goals

Water quality issues below/beyond the mine

Liability protection for 3rd party clean-up of abandoned mines in order to protect, restore, reconnect, and sustain our nation's cold-water fisheries and resources.

Mine waste remediation. Now that some are draining into the pipe, how does that change what its needed for remediation (waste/soil management)?

Water. Efficient treatment... ideally in a form that produces the lowest possible sludge volumes with power requirements that could be met by on-site renewables, or as a passive/active system that utilizes some remedial elements which allow dissolved metals to be deposited in the system for longer durations. Clearing up regulatory hurdles also remains a high priority, both in providing new opportunities for cleanup and in supporting local volunteers and watershed groups in their efforts.

Financial/Economics

Water treatment is cost effective for long-term operations.

Lime water treatment is an effective means for water treatment but not a long term cost effective option from the state perspective.

Remedial actions that have long-term effectiveness and have lower cost (comparatively to current standards) long term maintenance and operations

Silverton is focused on tourism- based recreation. The idea of technology industries locating here and their supporting infrastructure would be much more beneficial and would bring diversity to the economy and sustainable jobs.

Lack of funding for the AML program

We have to understand the value of waste, water, and tailings and other externalities. Otherwise it's very difficult to permit the mine of the future. The opportunity here is legacy issues or potential future legacy issues around water and waste. In order for the mining companies of the future to be able to permit these mines, we need to establish solutions to avoiding waste and water going forward.

Methods to repurpose metal sludge, whether milling or using as is. Create markets.

Informational/Technical/Educational

Need to understand the systems beyond the band aid.

Need to engage students and the public in the process and the solution.

Provide scientific and technical expertise to other entities who need hydrological, geological, and geochemical assistance and/or educational information on the characterization and remediation of legacy mine sites.

Making the infeasible feasible- two parts (1) scientifically understanding of the issue so you can deal with it, and (2) reducing the cost of dealing with it.

Metals we are dealing with are specific to each drainage and offer opportunities to study them with multiple unique sites from one general location. There is also the potential to study new metals that have not yet been mined but may be in the future.

Engage undergraduates in fundamental and applied research that could be conducted on-campus as well as in the field. The STEM departments are well staffed with research active faculty wishing to expand their projects to attract students. A new environmental science option is approved for the Fall 2018 semester, and the College will be acutely interested in attracting new faculty with research projects that match the “needs” of the 4-corners.

Legacy issues and preventing these from being legacy issues for the future. Solutions for draining mine adits in SJC to address BPMD. There is also lots of talk about banning sulfide in the Midwest- what they really want to deal with is AMD. So if we can avoid that, we can have solutions (passive (preferred), or active), better characterization and better mine planning.

Other

Establishing a process/center to foster the advancement of alternative treatment technologies for both AMD and active mine treatment. This priority possibly cannot be achieved within the present broad committee diversity but rather through a carve-out of interests. Need to demonstrate a benefit for the active mining interests, including Agency acceptance of results, to achieve significant buy in and participation from these entities.

B) Lower priority challenges that can be addressed or other benefits that a Center can provide that would bring value to you and your constituency. (Not in order of priority but bunched into three categories so you can see areas with greater emphasis.)

- 1) Informational/Educational/Technical**
- 2) Financial/Economics**
- 3) Governmental/Stakeholders**

Informational/Educational/Technical

Innovative cleanup technologies for acid rock drainage such as: monitoring, gear testing, report reviews and 3rd party data review.

This Center will operate as a think tank for environmental remediation.

Civic engagement and community service opportunities for youth.

Research and innovation directly related to legacy mining, independent of EPA.

Building additional communication tools for the general public and development of approaches to best address socio-economic, infrastructure and other potential community based issues.

Provide students with the opportunity to interact with experts in academia and the private sector. A center could also provide students with insights into how the private sector and government collaborate. Students majoring in disciplines outside of STEM (e.g., business, environmental studies, journalism) could also benefit from innovations and ideas from the Center.

Local issue is properly characterizing background- there is a reason that these deposits are there. Also feel that there is a show down coming up between agencies and mining community. Somewhere out there sits good science. Good science in characterizing true background is very important for BPMD and new sites around the world. There is an overwhelming amount of natural loading and finding the line where we as a society will accept the answers from science will be the challenge. Science agendas- need to establish ways to address bias and mistrust at the start.

Defining “success” with regards to treatment technologies and standardizing pilot technical approaches.

Financial/Economics

The economics of the cost opportunities is untouched yet. We appreciate processes that have useful, practical outcomes. Useful is defined as saving money and improving water quality. [expensive technology exists that is not feasible due to cost] The Center could look to solve issues and reduce costs.

Increased or a dedicated funding source. With the proposed elimination of EPA 319 NPS funds, AML funds are continually taking a hit. Instead of cutting programs to clean-up abandoned mines, we should be focusing on establishing funding sources.

Tangible results to the efforts-

- Benefits to other mine owners
- Tangible plans in place to identify, attract and support businesses

Governmental/Stakeholders

Agencies are still silos, and also not sharing data and information. They are acting like PRPs as per recent legal ruling.

The Center can be the space to bring a wide spectrum of stakeholders together and suggest concerns that we have not yet addressed.

Developing collaboration, relationship and opportunities for community building among all stakeholders, along with better lines of communication.

Mediating the space to collaborate will need to be intention. Stakeholder mapping will be critical to map agendas and establish a process. Include all stakeholders with an organizational structure with a collaborative approach with different views.

C) What are the key challenges you foresee in developing a Center to address your hard rock mining priorities? (Not in order of priority but bunched into four categories so you can see areas with greater emphasis.)

1) Funding/Staffing

2) Focus/Scope/Organization

3) Liability

4) Accessibility

Funding/Staffing

Funding. But, with adequate funding, some of the other challenges will be solved. The wide variety of topics and individual expertise that come to the table for discussion will mean that very different perspectives will lead to problems with communication and any consequent activities.

The capability to develop an interim and longer-range funding strategy.

Staffing and funding challenges are the key barriers. If hiring new staff, finding someone with a specific skill-set to address AML clean-up will be the biggest challenge from not only a technical perspective, but also a policy. Funding entities do not like to provide dedicated resources to salary without tangible on-the-ground improvement. Finding private donors to provide unrestricted funding will be a key.

Federal agencies use to coordinate and meet on a regular basis but funding and staffing challenges have made it difficult to continue regular coordination.

Staff members will be needed, not only to keep track of meetings and activities, but also to coordinate continually with State and Federal agencies and professional society meetings. Then there are non-professional society meetings and staff members will need to compile available information for funding possibilities.

Reduce costs for trials (dorms, inexpensive housing) to reduce company costs to test and explore. AMD testing is a fall season, or maybe winter and spring- extend the season. Treatment can be a year round activity, and accessible on certain roads. Instrumenting with sensors that could be monitored remotely year round.

Funding and the ability to build trust among agencies, stakeholders and industry.

Funding to build center and the capital needed to get it started. Governmental and legal issues I feel we can get around and feel strongly that there can be projects of NPL caliber that can be brought into the program for actual real project scenarios and meaningful research.

Funding, and the time (primary resource) to work on it- buy professors out of teaching obligations. Want mine-water on tap. Not sure we are speaking the same language of what and why an institute must have a compelling vision and mission. If you make it too small, its not compelling. If it's looking at two Superfund sites, may be compelling with a 5-10 year scale so aim big.

Innovation- reducing costs, cost-effective methods, level of clean up is limited by cost. What has been done is what is feasible/cost affordable. Tech changes costs.

The two biggest obstacles that we foresee are securing a facility and funding it.

Focus/Scope/Organization

Development of a concise, achievable vision and “business” plan given the existing diverse interests represented.

Need to be clear as to Center’s role in active vs. legacy mining issues or is it both?

Formulating a manageable process to develop and allow a meaningful outcome in a reasonable timeline.

Regulatory agencies are not our focus. Our focus is to understand. Industry doesn’t like being unasked and told what to do. Regulatory driven is very prescriptive without knowing how the system is working. Don’t let them limit future options. We need a broad look, beyond one site or situation. Not one way of doing it, no absolutes. Understand different options and possibilities.

Superfund designation helps with studying stuff. Pilot tests without a permit. Big difference with any other place. Most superfunds are limited in scope. This one is not. We have a lot of drainages with different problems- so lots of variety in concoctions and solutions, concentrations.

Physical centers, operations model, who owns it, who is it serving, liability, designs programs. Who is in control of the program/partnerships and what is the community tie?

Large database to compare information- we will be the source of information about abandoned mines in US. Be the US linch-pin, world-wide leader of abandoned mines. Establish and support the state of the practice and present honest and unbiased information. Mobilize the students and citizens, develop real time data flows, invite anyone to do research with these resources, teachers, and students.

Coordinating the efforts of the large group of entities on the Steering Committee.

Bias. And Management. How do we manage the individual stakeholders to be productive? Establishing performance measures- key performance indicators. Would be good to establish these early and with intention. Set goals and objectives with measureable outcomes.

Proving tech to everyone’s satisfaction.

Liability

Public-private cooperation is necessary but misunderstandings can easily lead to litigious situations. Hence, very clear ground rules for cooperation must be documented and agreed upon at the start.

Cleaning water quality is a political issue, with liability, etc. Shift the equation by figuring out a potential for profits. Rico and a passive system for here- we would be selling acids. BLM, EPA and USFS legal hang ups take time/effort to overcome.

Accessibility

Another barrier is the challenge of getting to Silverton as flights/driving not easy. Clear Creek is closer to a lot of people and similar issues.

Previous conversations of a testing facility

- BLM has land that is to the south- closer to the ski area.
- There is another site where the pipeline comes through for RB, above Gladstone.
 - Challenges were concerned about if a mining claim would shut down the ability to move forward. Could ask BLM to withdraw the mineral rites to keep that from happening.
- Design: access to water, tanks, counter, drains, bench and plumbing.
- Keep using the lab in Durango- don't need our own ICP machine.

D) Are you aware of other initiatives or entities with similar goals/missions? How could the Steering Committee and eventually the Center itself best work with these entities going forward?

Other organizations with similar goals include:
INAP (International Network for Acid Prevention)
ADTI (Acid Drainage Tech Initiative)
SME (Society for Mining, Metallurgy and Exploration)

EPA's Office of Research & Development, Animas River Stakeholder Group, BPMD Citizen Superfund Group, and Trout Unlimited AML

The Summitville Superfund Site has been offered up for a similar purpose and could be used by this group as well. Objective is to promote the State's goals of providing options for long-term fiscal efficiencies.

Clear Creek has similar issues in terms of AMD, but not sure how much space they have or ability to test things there. They are much closer to Denver and School of Mines, so clear advantage in being easy to access and in the Denver water supply.

Consider the Colorado College model where counties pay into supporting the college and/or draw from partners- CDPHE, SJ Development.

EPA ORD research and technology efforts. Possible some Western State based technology activities. Private party research centers and a compendium of known approaches (which I suggest may not be well "catalogued")

DOI Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement -- Acid Drainage Technology Initiative (OSMRE ADTI)

There are associations, but this initiative is unique.

- Mine industry
- Academic- Dirck Vanzel, University of British Columbia with Priscilla Nelson
- Luke Danielson, Western U- they are looking to Ben Butler Mine, north of London mine on BPMD, Bill Simons key focal area- waste rock, then a burn zone down the slope near Denver Hill. They wanted to come up with an easy solution that enabled academic and students to come in with easy modifications. Looking to have Fort Lewis involved, and Uof C, putting together a group to use this project and do other small projects, where the underlying owner does not have responsibility.
 - Josh Parrell, working on the CleanTech Challenge. Represents the RCF and Jolymont interests.
 - Larry no longer part of Jolly Mont. He is the COO of New Tracks, headquarters are in Montreal. Looking to fill the role that Larry filled.

E) There are potentially a number of ways to structure and/or operate a Center or Centers. These include, a physical location near mine sites, a virtual network, a hosted entity, etc., or a combination of the foregoing. Please provide your list of advantages and disadvantage to each of these three options?

Having a center near mine sites is most helpful. For example, if the Center was located at Durango with a field office in Silverton as a base camp for field and educational activities, that might be ideal.

Since DOI is considering reorganization, might want to focus on a USFS co-location in an area of greatest need. If multiple Centers are in the picture, I would propose locations in or near a technical university town would be a good choice. NM School of Mines, SD School of Mines, CO School of Mines, MT Tech, etc. A virtual set-up would not be impossible, and may be the most financially viable way to get a Center up and running short-term.

These structural approaches are not mutually exclusive and probably complementary for the technology aspects of a Center. Suggest dividing the Center into Centers of interest and then ask this question of specific interested constituencies. For socio-economic or infrastructure priorities, I see no advantage to a location other than impacted community(s) with perhaps a master host location. For technology a hosted entity would likely fan out to both an in-situ location as well as virtual networks (assuming I understand this broad undefined term).

A center located in or near Silverton with opportunities in the region close by to test and implement projects would be preferred. A combination of on site (center location in Silverton to run laboratory tests) and the need for onsite satellite “sheds” or “structures” that will ease in the ability to effectively implement this.

More of an institute as it's less limited than a Center. Institutes have centers within them. There are lots of centers that can be under the umbrella. Coalition of partners and sites. Institute umbrella, coalition of centers or partners. Could be individual

members, organizational members. People who buy into the mission and intend to be part of it. Could be top down (bylaws, committee structure), but limited appeal. If you play it right, it would be grassroots and inviting in.

Start with the two Superfund sites (BPMD, Clear Creek) and mobilize the state and citizenry. Have founding members and create a high-level mission and intellectual development.

Past good ideas-

- Denver meetings with high-level EPA managers.
- Working with DC staff to help understand the situation.
- Don't get involved in Good Sam
- Getting them on tours- need to see the ground.

Onsite classroom environment with hands-on learning that facilitates access. Consider whether this is field school level, or more polished- professional lab. Include dormitory or visiting professors space and lab/presentation space. Also need showcase area- stage, library, or exhibit hall.

A physical space for the center in Silverton is a good idea. This would be a physical location for people to stop by, as well as the center for a coinciding virtual network. Having the center in Silverton would also benefit from the continual agency involvement through the Superfund site. Disadvantages to this would be the isolation in Silverton. It is not an easy place to get to for most of the State so being willing to travel to conferences and keep up an online presence will be essential in maintaining the visibility of the center.

Virtual Network: Given Silverton isolation, I think a combined approach to a virtual network run out of a physical location in Silverton would be a great idea. This would allow interaction with experts across the US and world to provide input on ideas and problems. Disadvantages would be a stand alone model. This needs to be combined with an actual location where bench scale studies could take place, and staff are available to meet with agency folks and other partners.

Physical location advantages

- Provides a place where different users can more readily collaborate
- Provides a place that is proximate to hard rock mining historical sites providing easy access for field work, etc.
- Gives a more tangible identity to the Center
- More likely attracts a range of science/business groups to address challenges

Disadvantages

- Cost and time frame - longer to get up and running than a virtual network

Virtual location advantages

- Likely less expensive and would likely be operational in a shorter time frame

Disadvantages

- May be too much of a hurdle to get a true Center - disperse user groups would have limited time/opportunity for face-to-face discussions
- More challenging to conduct lab and field work as a collaborative project

A physical location would give credibility, credence, and facilities to advance tech innovation and startups under some level of supervision/guidance and provide for a centralized certification. I believe these elements will all be critical to the success of the Center's mission. The real hurdle there is cost. A virtual presence could be a solid place to start, however. Develop the coalition, create guidance, and establish the credibility via vetted articles, insights, and leadership via conferences/outreach

- A variety of structures, needs to fit objectives. Facilities research around key subjects, not simply academic endeavor. How do you make it an economic endeavor? Are we doing work for the industry in general? Unlikely to get economic returns? Are we taking on specific projects that offer industry specific players? Working for agencies? How can you make money doing what we need to be doing?
- Need to understand the market- what does it look like? How do we serve that market? Design the center around that market? Opportunities for self-funding activities?
- Endowment? Sponsored by industry and society? The good is the return, dealing with the long-term problem.
- Hybrid- Create the technology- hire engineers and scientists to create tech as a part of the center (instead of conveying other people through the process).
- Endowment space- ESG type funding, looking to fund endowments that have returns on investments. Could think about how to design a concept, could reach into that funding model if the right foundation exists out there. May be a good match up, funds for the environment, a return on investment. Hewletts, Packards, Tiffany, foundations that put will appreciate a compelling story that seeks to address the consequences of mining.

F) Resource and funding for scoping, start up and long term operations of a Center will be required. Please provide your suggestions for short and long term funding and resource options. Short term might include governmental, industry, academic and philanthropic options. Long term could include those options, and/or some type of fee structure for users of the Center.

The potential funding description above is good and I would support it. Of course, the lawyers would have to look at what options will need careful appraisal to avoid litigation, misunderstandings, and especially incorrect perceptions. Dominant support by any single entity (e.g., one mining company or just a consortium of government regulatory agencies) must be avoided.

You need to engage people that can make funding decisions. In other words, agency personnel who can commit funds.

For operations, a relaxed schedule so that adjustments could be made when multiple problems arose. There are always going to be unforeseeable problems. Technology try-outs need time. Access to local machine shop is imperative.

Presently, I see it as an industry, academia and philanthropic endeavor.

CMA is mostly small producers, not the big companies that have resources to put into the Center or innovating remediation. Need to go higher in the food chain.

OSMRE funding opportunity

* need to develop operational model to determine what resources are needed and available- this will help drive it. Need to do a study to support the concept

* potential special district (tax or set aside) throughout the watershed- all the way down into NM to support the center, through a regional collaboration.

* round up program

A combination of funding sources will be needed. Grantors are apprehensive to provide money for personnel without on-the-ground results. Therefore, you will need a combination of un-restricted funding from private donors, mining companies, & partners to cover personnel costs while filling in the gaps with grant funds for project specific goals of the center.

Beyond a hoped for plan development grant, it is not easy to address funding absent a realistic "business plan". A team will likely be necessary to visit select foundation, etc., plus agencies for developmental funding. With a reasonable "business plan" it might be possible to generate interim funding from both public, non-profit and industry. The key will be to have a real plan to sell not just a vision.

Longer term the technology aspects of a Center(s) could attempt funding through a delegation process from EPA to manage technology development, vetting and tracking. At present, this process is often done by a for-profit contractor so there could be a benefit to the Agency. Another source of funding would be a full paid fee on the part of any technology proponent to use the Center's facilities, processes or approval process. (ala Good Housekeeping).

This really depends on the vision for the Center. How much of the Center's efforts will be as a business incubator? If a significant portion, is an SBIR grant a good way to go? Given budget constraints in the State of Colorado, it might be difficult to obtain funding from academia. Perhaps the steering committee could consider models like CIRES (at CU Boulder). If the Center was physically located in Silverton, it seems reasonable to develop a fee-structure for use of the facility.

- Foundation space- could be a fit
- Grant space- (not his specialty)
- Start up work- typically limited dollars
- High net worth individuals with the right agenda
- Industry sponsorship, participation. A challenge, especially in leaner times, the R&D element is often lagging. One could approach companies- Kinross, Newmont, Heclas, with presense geographically related or issue related. What is the return on the investment?
- Consulting firms, if business opportunity
- OEMs that might sponsor- if a pump manufacturer, may want to be a sponsor.

Need to answer the return on investment question for all of these- It's a few

Possible licensing if the center actually develops Tech, or JV situations with startups. Water rights/use? Clean water bonuses?? Hydroelectric? Repurposing/sale/broker cut if creating market for extracted metal sludges.

G) If a Center(s) is to succeed, what are the key partners in your view (in addition to the Steering Committee) that must have a primary role in its development and operation?

Key partners must include those who have a solid background in geological, hydrological, geochemical, chemical, microbiological, biological, mine waste management, and engineering related to metal mine wastes and their remediation.

The Federal Mining Dialogue, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Interior, U.S. Forest Service, State Mining Departments, Local stakeholders, Contractors, and Colleges and Universities.

I see the various regional academia institutions that will be the key players in this. I feel the governmental agencies are support to the center. If there were to be a Summitville center, Rio Grande County would be a key player, so the counties and municipalities would also be key players in each center.

Clear Creek (Dave Holm) and Trout Unlimited (Jason Willis).
Doug Young, Keystone Center
Not sure regulators can be at the core of the formation.

Midlevel managers at multiple agencies- make presentations.
Hardest part is getting it be a sizable concept that you can manage. Flipping the equation to be about generating revenues, instead of balancing costs. Looking at marketable products. Doesn't need to make money, needs to just reduce costs.
Target people who can generate revenue some how.

Local Counties,
Agencies- EPA, CDPHE, DRMS,
Business development orgs- Region 9,
Private agencies- colleges, universities,
PRPs- could they exchange liability for community investments? Incentives?
Offering a positive role in the development of the community
Up and coming entrepreneurs

Newmont, Sunnyside, etc., should be involved in the long-term viability discussion. This may give them the opportunity to develop or share some of their innovative technologies being used on larger scale sites. Other key partners would be EPA, USFS, BLM, DRMS, and other local and larger non-profits.

Key partners only for technology: EPA (federal rep); various State environmental management agencies; industry and NGOs with a demonstrated technical ability. Technology advocates should be invited to input to the development process sharing their knowledge and interests without having a "vote".

Need to define beyond the BPMD and look globally. Need to be designed to deal with this. We do not want to be defined by BPMD- it provides an opportunity but it does not define us. Need to make sure this is understood very early on.

All of the state and federal agencies which impose the regulatory/create the liability restrictions. Being able to provide a safe testing space for groups to work on water is a truly unique niche, and that can only happen if regulators are on board and encouraging the work. From there, industry will absolutely follow.

H) What is your organization's level of willingness to engage in the development of a Center(s) on a scale of 1 (not really willing) to 10 (extremely willing)? And by engagement we mean things, for example, such as serving on a work group to develop a charter or operating details for the Center and/or serving on an eventual Board of Directors of a Center.

Responses ranged from an enthusiastic 4 to even more enthusiastic 10s with everything in between. Workloads, funding, federal reorganization, retirements, etc., are factors that will limit folks ability to help but all members of the Committee expressed ongoing willingness to contribute assistance in one form or another.

I) What other issues do you think should be surfaced for the Steering Committee to consider regarding the potential for a Center?

Fort Lewis College is a 4-year, public, liberal arts college located in Durango, CO. We are the closest College to the proposed Science and Innovation Center and offer B.S. degrees in all of the STEM disciplines. The College has laboratory space for basic and applied research and a highly research active faculty. The Chemistry Department is well equipped and Geochemistry and Engineering reside in a brand-new state-of-the-art building offering a wide range of tools. The biologists in the Biology Department are all research active and well versed in the Animas River watershed.

A direct contact with State and Federal legislators will need to be a part of the Center. If innovative techniques and proposed legislation needs will be developed at the Center, making a difference with lawmakers will be essential. There is already a strong influence with staffers from the Durango area, but it will be essential in maintaining, and further including their input in the Center. The Steering Committee needs to figure out how best to utilize the Center. What I mean by this is not duplicating the efforts of partners in the area, but figuring out how to gather all partner ideas/goals and become the face of AML research in the SW.

The most important issue I see is the ability to develop a focused, manageable process with clearly delineated goals with achievable objectives, etc.

Even though more voices can slow things down or create a little chaos, casting as wide a net as possible early could help to continue the development of conceptual brainstorming, funding ideas and avenues, and identification of individuals really committed to making all of this go.

END